

Research Based Student Improvement:

Does research support curriculum alignment and
is CSCOE a valid tool to accomplish the process?

Patricia Startz

9/9/2012

Abstract: This action research project determined whether or not the implementation of an aligned curriculum is a research based approach to school improvement and to determine a candidate for the technology enhanced curriculum alignment tool package suitable for deployment in a small rural K-12 public school district. The project follows the writer/researcher through the process, from research through the initial training and deployment of the CSCOE package, a technology enhanced, research based curriculum alignment tool.

EDLD 5398: Patricia Startz SID: L20052259 Internship for Principal

Introduction / Background (Section One)

Falls City ISD is a small rural school located in South Central Texas. Our student population is typically less than 365 students. As documented in the Texas Academic Excellence Indicator System (AEIS) which may be accessed at this URL, <http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/perfreport/aeis/> using the district's county code, 128904 or the individual campus codes 128904001 (High School) and 128904101 (Elementary), about 97% of the student population is white. There is a growing number of Hispanic and African American families; however, their numbers are so small that AEIS reports generally have *'s in place of percentages on most disaggregated reports. The free and reduced lunch count is about 21%, earning the district a 50% E-Rate telecommunications discount. The district's network servers and switches, and amount of available bandwidth have been a problem when considering outside classroom resources for day-to-day use. Another consideration is the type of internet access, computers, phones, and pad devices teachers and students have available after hours to access materials for classroom preparation and homework.

FCISD administrators, teachers, parents and students have the expectation that the majority of the student body will perform at exemplary levels on state assessments; the district has maintained that performance level for about five years. The Texas Education Agency (TEA) has redesigned state assessment instruments; they are now called STAAR assessments. Teachers wanted to begin preparing and adjusting their curriculum to prepare students to be successful as soon as they heard about the new assessment instrument, but TEA was very secretive about the new format only saying that knowledge and skills will be assessed to greater degrees of depth and breadth. In order to begin preparations, teachers participated in an online professional

EDLD 5398: Patricia Startz SID: L20052259 Internship for Principal

development program in August 2011, but were not confident that was enough. Each year, teachers in almost every grade level complain of learning gaps, i.e. material that should have been covered in previous coursework, but was not.

After providing professional development during Fall 2011 in-service, administrators deemed it necessary for students to undergo the first round of STAAR assessments in order to utilize the data to determine their next course of action. The raw data is now in: The data for the 2012 9th grade subset of the district's K-12 population was analyzed and summarized in the findings tables. The subjects reviewed included Algebra I, Biology, English I Reading, English I Writing, and World Geography. There were a total of 25 students in this group, of these 25 students, 10 demonstrated advanced performances in Algebra I, 5 demonstrated advanced performances in World Geography, 4 demonstrated advanced performances in English I Reading, only 1 demonstrated advanced performance in Biology, and no student demonstrated advanced performance in English I Writing. The two English courses indicate the most need of improvement with three areas in which the average performance was below 51%. Biology was slightly better with three areas of performance below 60%. English is one of the courses in which teachers have voiced concerns about the learning gaps. The data seems to suggest there is reason for concern where English, World Geography, and Biology are concerned.

During the interim, the leadership team considered the next course of action. They each had heard of CSCOE in previous administrative meetings and in various meetings throughout the last few years. The questions to be answered were:

EDLD 5398: Patricia Startz SID: L20052259 Internship for Principal

Is curriculum alignment necessary for STAAR success and is CSCOPE a viable research based tool/tool set to achieve both alignment and STAAR assessment success?

Initially, administrators and teachers will benefit from the research to determine research based answers to the stated questions, but it should be noted that students will be the ultimate benefactors. At the moment, teachers want to teach students what they need to know to be successful STAAR testers; they are not really sure how to achieve that, but the spring assessments definitely indicated that the issue of learning gaps must be addressed. CSCOPE is a research based collection of curriculum lessons for all core courses aligned to the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS). It builds spiraling content coverage into the appropriate timelines to ensure students have been exposed to the appropriate content with samples of exemplar lessons. Each course provides an annual timeline, unit plans, individual lessons, and lesson extensions for diverse student populations. One can utilize the database to compare course/grade level requirements enabling teachers to meet their course requirements with technology infused lessons that will close learning gaps. This study should provide further documentation that proper curriculum alignment will increase the depth and breadth of student learning increasing their level of cognitive knowledge while improving their performance on the STAAR assessment.

Literature Review (Section Two)

In searching for the answers to the Action Research questions, several articles were reviewed and will be discussed in this section of the report. As demonstrated with the data above, student performance was not horrible on the Spring 2012 STAAR assessments, but it is not Exemplary and it is indicative that learning gaps exist. Fullan (2002) bolsters the idea held by many educators that:

EDLD 5398: Patricia Startz SID: L20052259 Internship for Principal

“Only principals who are equipped to handle a complex, rapidly changing environment can implement the reforms that lead to sustained improvement in student achievement” (p. 16). His article further details several core strategies in leading successful change. They include:

“nested learning communities, principal institutes, leadership for instruction, peer learning, and individual coaching” (Fullan, 2002, p.16). In the principal’s support of my research and her suggestion that one or two other lead teachers also research the issue of CSCOPE as a solution to closing achievement gaps, the principal demonstrated the use of a nested learning community.

Both the superintendent and the principal attend *Team of Eight* training and their respective training institutes. Both have further supported the training of teachers to lead our peers in this process and provide individual coaching. It is these last couple of processes that lead to getting very involved in the process of change through helping peers who do not necessarily want to change. Fullan (2002) warns that: “...the first 6 months or so of implementation will be bumpy, but advises that doubters sometimes have important points that should be addressed. He further points out ...that changing what people in the organization value and how they work together to accomplish it---leads to deep, lasting change” (p. 18). This change must be bolstered by building relationships, sharing the creation of knowledge, and the creation of a systemic understanding of the process.

(Educational Research Service, 2003) explains curriculum coherence and alignment while it addresses the benefits and challenges school administrators can expect during the process. Smith, Smith, and Bryk (1998) (as cited by Educational Research Service, 2003) found

“Students who pass through these unaligned and incoherent instructional programs may “experience delays, repetitions, and/or skips in core knowledge and skills in

EDLD 5398: Patricia Startz SID: L20052259 Internship for Principal

ways that seriously diminish their chances for success in school and, in particular, on the tests used to measure their knowledge and their progress””(p. 11).

This profound statement begs yet another question... Why does aligning curriculum seem to improve student performance? (Educational Research Service, 2003) cite authors Newmann, Smith, Allensworth, and Bryk (2001) to report that “Compared to disconnected short-term experiences, integrated experiences, sustained long enough for successful completion, provide greater clarity about what is required for mastery, and how prior knowledge can be applied to future questions” (p. 15).

Liebling (1997) concludes “one element has been identified as key to successful improvement efforts: alignment of what is tested with what is taught” (p. 1).

The literary review process uncovered a December 2005 unpublished literary review written by David A. Squires for *Edvantia*. His summary paragraph succinctly defines Curriculum alignment and its research basis; as such it is worth quoting verbatim.

“Curriculum alignment includes alignment between and among several education variables, including state standards, state-mandated assessments, resources such as textbooks, content of instruction, and instructional strategies. The studies reported in this review provide strong evidence from scientifically based research that aligning the various components can have positive significant effects” (p. 5)

After reading these two articles, the question of whether or not curriculum alignment is a key factor to improving student performance on statewide assessments was answered with a definitive **YES**.

The articles previously reviewed spoke of school districts devoting countless hours developing and aligning their own curriculum. Educators across the state of Texas read these

EDLD 5398: Patricia Startz SID: L20052259 Internship for Principal

articles when they were originally published, realized the mammoth task that was being recommended, and believed in the expertise of the authors enough to request and invest in help from their regional service centers in developing curriculum aligned to the then current state assessment, TAKS. As a result, regional service center curriculum specialists, district level content experts, and teachers have worked for nearly a decade to develop an alignment tool that not only provides a coherent scope and sequence, but also provides busy teachers with sample units, sample exemplary lesson plans, and even sample assessments written in the same format as the state assessment instrument: this tool package was given the name CSCOPE.

Robert Marzano's 2003 study (as cited in TESCCC 2008) found "that a guaranteed and viable curriculum is the most powerful school-level factor in determining overall student achievement" (p. 2). The article further states, "Districts and schools must ensure that the intended curriculum (in Texas, The Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS) and district curriculum) is implemented consistently by all teachers. In turn, the attained curriculum—what students actually learn—should align with the intended and implemented curricula (p. 2)." Those statements further reinforce the necessity of adoption of a research based curriculum alignment tool throughout the district as a means to improve student performance. The remainder of the article explains how CSCOPE accomplishes both vertical and horizontal alignment of curricula with the Year- at-a-glance document, unit plans, lesson plans, exemplar lesson samples, manipulative templates, and sample assessments. To review CSCOPE'S qualifications: it meets teacher requests for STAAR aligned instructional supplements and applies the process of curriculum alignment to achieve teaching and learning improvement.

According to the TESCCC article about the adoption of CSCOPE, "The biggest impact of CSCOPE will be in the ongoing curriculum and instruction discussions around vertical

EDLD 5398: Patricia Startz SID: L20052259 Internship for Principal

alignment, instructional focus, lesson planning and pedagogy”(p. 14). This researcher agrees with that statement. In the months since the possible deployment of CSCAPE was first mentioned, our teachers have had more productive, solution oriented discussions about curriculum than witnessed since the adoption of the TAKS assessment. They have moved beyond complaining about each other’s teaching practices to working together to provide a systemic alignment of our K-12 curriculum to the latest state standards in a concerted effort to close the learning gaps for all FCISD students. That is quite an accomplishment as well as a critically necessary piece of the process of school improvement.

Jay McTighe and Ronald S. Thomas (2003) comment that “Looking back to the key concepts and essential questions that underlie content standards can help identify learning goals and provide the starting point for planning both curriculum and school improvement” (p. 52). Their recommended process can be summarized in three steps:

“ Determine learning goals; Collect, analyze, and summarize evidence from multiple sources; Consider the root causes of present achievement and then—and only then—implement systemic actions to address root causes, promote enduring learning, and increase test scores” (p. 55).

In keeping with the above authors’ recommendations, FCISD administrators decided to implement the use of the CSCAPE package, “A Guaranteed and Viable curriculum.”

It is this researcher’s belief that this Literature Review answered the question of whether or not aligned curriculum is necessary to improve student performance on STAAR assessments. It also led to the understanding that CSCAPE is a “guaranteed and viable curriculum” that provides a technology enhanced research based curriculum alignment package, and guidelines for the implementation process with professional development planning to meet the needs of our teachers as they begin the process of a district wide K-12 curriculum alignment.

Action Research Design (Section Three)

Subjects

The subjects are the K-12 teachers of FCISD and ultimately their students. Year 1 STAAR data was made available for data analysis of the performance of the 2012 9th graders.

Procedures

This research project started by asking the question: what kinds of questioning can be utilized with interactive student response systems to help teachers ask higher level questions? The principal did not support that project, and as I studied the situation, I realized that although it would be helpful for a small group of teachers to experiment with fun technologically infused lessons, there was a systemic issue that needed to be quickly addressed. Through teacher comments, it became apparent that many upper level teachers are concerned that learning gaps in previous courses will negatively impact their ability to help students meet the new standards as set forth by TEA with mastery assessments known as STAAR. Our teachers are accustomed to utilizing benchmark assessments to fill learning gaps; however, they are unsure how to address some of the cognitive skill sets being assessed by the new assessment instruments. There are no benchmark instruments available (previous released tests). This researcher reviewed articles and books about vocabulary, questioning, using interactive response systems, etc. then, while working with a group of teachers from other schools, was introduced to CSCAPE and had the opportunity to see how easy it was to look at a topic to determine what should be taught about it at every grade level. Not only did the tool include alignment information, it included technology infused exemplary lessons with extensions for diverse classrooms.

I asked my superintendent and principal if they had considered CSCAPE as a means of closing the educational gaps of which many teachers complained. They told me to contact the region center and other educators I might know to get more information about what it is and

EDLD 5398: Patricia Startz SID: L20052259 Internship for Principal

what it can help our teachers do. This researcher discussed the CSCOE tool with several principals at a Regional Curriculum Advisory meeting in April 2012. The general consensus was that it was a valuable tool they considered vital in preparing their teachers and students for success on upcoming STAAR assessments. The administration wanted to wait until they got scores for the first round of tests; after that, they advised me to proceed. I and an elementary teacher who holds her administrative curriculum design master's degree as well as her principal's certification have worked together to coordinate training, and district wide deployment of CSCOE. We aided teacher training, and have been available to help teachers upon request. Additional 1:1 sessions are being planned as soon as focus areas are determined. The initial timeline for the 1:1 training was early October; however, after discussing the status of the deployment and realizing several elementary teachers are very overwhelmed, we decided bringing that 1:1 to teachers earlier may improve their understanding of the process and alleviate some of their frustration. It is possible the use of a reflection document might provide the opportunity for teachers to clarify the processes in which they are involved and reinforce the gains in student achievement that will result. Having received permission of the original author, Ronald Thomas, I plan to utilize the reflection guides he provided in his 2006 article, "How to Survive Data Overload", to develop some quick online surveys that are easy for teachers to utilize as part of their curriculum discussions and even integrate into their lesson development processes.

As learned in the literary review, it is critical to develop and maintain communication, especially with the "naysayers." Their concerns do seem valid and will be discussed in the Findings Section.

Findings Section:

In order to create the shared vision, I relayed teachers concerns about curriculum gaps creating critical assessment deficiencies; commented that the research that I was reading indicated research based curriculum alignment tools could mend the gaps; reminded administrators that the bandwidth situation should be resolved by June 2012 and the school(s) revenue situation was improving enough to allow for repairs to network infrastructure that should enable fluent use of external internet based resources; finally I informed them that my experience with CSCOPE had been very positive, if somewhat limited and suggested we all research its capabilities further. They each did their own questioning, as did I at a regional curriculum meeting and the region 3 educational service center. The joint conclusion was that CSCOPE is a viable research based tool to help teachers better align their curriculum to TEA curriculum standards for each K-12 course. As a result, information about CSCOPE was given to teachers and offered as a means to address their curriculum alignment concerns, in addition to providing them a curriculum development resource with abundant exemplary lessons from which to create their new personally customized STAAR aligned curriculum. While some teachers expressed reservations, they each felt like it was a positive effort to meet new curriculum standards without waiting for a succession of poor assessment results to dictate local and possible state corrective measures be taken. Teachers have been assured that the tool is just that, a resource from which to create their new curriculum, they are still in charge of their own classrooms and their own curriculum. We all share the vision of “Learning for all whatever it takes!”; CSCOPE, the research based curriculum alignment tool is seen a resource with which teachers can ensure and document the provision of curriculum that meets TEA curriculum standards at every grade level K-12. In order to promote community (teacher) involvement,

EDLD 5398: Patricia Startz SID: L20052259 Internship for Principal

district administrators have paid for initial training and offered a compensation day for those that attend training voluntarily prior to August in-service to a conflict in the regional service center's staff schedules.

When it comes to resource management and mobilizing community resources, my role will be to insure that the internet, network, and network computers are functioning at peak levels so that network connectivity cannot be blamed for poor program performance and cited as a reason teachers might choose not to use the resource during the school year. It also includes the role of District/Campus CSCOPE administrator. I have to make sure the annual budget allows for the inclusion of the CSCOPE program, CSCOPE training, time allotted for teacher planning, network and computer repairs, as well as network training for new network software for me and one assistant. In order to better implement CSCOPE and support its use, I am working with the 3rd grade teacher and certified curriculum specialist Cathy Stolle, to become very fluent in the nuances of the program CSCOPE in order to provide exemplary support as teachers implement its resources and procedures into their daily instructional patterns. I will need to schedule additional Region 3 face-to-face support in addition to personal face-to-face support on an as needed basis throughout the school year and possibly beyond.

Initial conclusions indicate that systemic curriculum alignment is one way to improve student performance including formal statewide assessments and that CSCOPE is a viable, research based and proven tool for providing K-12 teachers with curriculum and practice assessments aligned to STAAR assessments. Our teachers want to help our students master new TEA curriculum standards and enable them to successfully demonstrate that mastery via the latest statewide assessment tool, STAAR. In order to continue the districts' Exemplary Performance record without missing a beat, the majority of teachers were in favor of

EDLD 5398: Patricia Startz SID: L20052259 Internship for Principal

implementing CSCOPE; it is therefore, an extension of the district's positive performance based culture.

I will ask the superintendent if they can be asked to mention the impact of CSCOPE training and resources to their teaching practice as part of their evaluation documentation and we will collect and compare the 2013 EOC results for the 9th graders of 2012 and 2013 to see if valid conclusions about performance can be drawn.... I am still determining how to do this as no final conclusions or results are readily available at this point.

As the research project comes to its conclusion, my results will be disseminated to our local community, our regional service center, posted on my blog, and possibly posted with other classmates' research projects on a Lamar Action Research Site. It is my hope that my research will provide enough evidence that CSCOPE is a valid research based tool to support curriculum alignment as a means to improve student performance on formal statewide assessments to convince my local teachers to stick with it and other districts, in need of systemic improvement the information they need to convince them to try it. In order to do that, it is necessary to provide professional development in copious quantities. See the professional growth plan for teachers on the next page.

| CSCOPE Implementation Professional Growth Plan | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|--|
| Action Step(s) | Person(s) Responsible | Timeline: | Needed Resources | Evaluation |
| Provide Instructional Leader Initial CSCOPE Introductory Training | Researcher Superintendent | July 27, 2012 | Transportation Personal computers Willing Staff Members Training session at R20 and their training staff | Attendance Log; Training evaluations |
| Provide District & Campus Administrators Initial Administration CSCOPE training | Researcher Superintendent Principal | August 6, 2012 | Transportation Personal computers Willing Staff Members Training Staff at R3 | Attendance Log Training Evaluations |
| Provide teachers introductory CSCOPE training prior to start of school so they can better utilize it to prepare for first weeks of school | Researcher Superintendent Principal | August 15, 2012 | Peak performing Network and network computers for teacher instruction; Teacher handouts, i.e. TEKS, CSCOPE brief history & uses, instructions, notebooks for CSCOPE resources; | Expectations survey Training Evaluation |
| Provide teachers hands-on curriculum development via CSCOPE training | Researcher Superintendent Principal | Aug. 21, 2012 Aug. 22, 2012 Sept.26,2012 Sept.27,2012 Timeline to be determined as needed. | CSCOPE training literature, peak performing network infrastructure and workstations in the labs (for instruction) and in classrooms for teacher use after instruction. | Expectations survey; Training evaluation; Right fit survey. Availability for 1:1 training in September, October, and February, March of 2012-2013 school year. |

Keywords and phrases:

Curriculum alignment, CSCOPE, technology tools for curriculum alignment....

Data Collection

I utilized information from informal interviews with administrators from other schools, student test results, i.e. AEIS reports from prior years and raw results from the 2012 freshman class EOC STAAR assessment administration. The raw results were collected into tables and calculations performed to determine % right for each student, for each objective and the average % correct for each group for the objective. The margin between standards of performance was noted as well as the objective with best and worst performance objectives.

EDLD 5398: Patricia Startz SID: L20052259 Internship for Principal

Findings (Section Four)

The STAAR EOC results for 2012 9th graders, verified the need for improvement in instruction for this group of students. See the table below and on the next four pages.

Table 1. Spring 2012 9th Grade Algebra STAAR EOC Results- Raw Data

| Alg1 | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--------|--------|--|--------|--------|------|-------|-------------------------|--------|-------------------------|
| FR | PAF | LF | LEI | QONF | Total | SSS | MS | SP | AP | |
| 7/8 | 1 | 13/15 | 1 | 7/9 | 49/54 | 4810 | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| 1 | 3/4 | 3/5 | 9/10 | 8/9 | 43/54 | 4392 | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| 5/8 | 3/4 | 11/15 | 3/5 | 2/3 | 37/54 | 4121 | 1 | 1 | 0 | |
| 1/2 | 5/12 | 8/15 | 1/2 | 1/3 | 25/54 | 3686 | 1 | 1 | 0 | |
| 3/4 | 2/3 | 3/5 | 4/5 | 2/3 | 37/54 | 4121 | 1 | 1 | 0 | |
| 3/4 | 3/4 | 11/15 | 9/10 | 2/3 | 41/54 | 4293 | 1 | 1 | 0 | |
| 7/8 | 2/3 | 11/15 | 7/10 | 7/9 | 20/27 | 4248 | 1 | 1 | 0 | |
| 3/4 | 7/12 | 11/15 | 3/10 | 2/3 | 11/18 | 3969 | 1 | 1 | 0 | |
| 1/2 | 3/4 | 11/15 | 1/2 | 8/9 | 37/54 | 4121 | 1 | 1 | 0 | |
| 7/8 | 3/4 | 11/15 | 7/10 | 4/9 | 19/27 | 4162 | 1 | 1 | 0 | |
| 1 | 1 | 4/5 | 1 | 1 | 17/18 | 5056 | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| 5/8 | 7/12 | 2/3 | 4/5 | 7/9 | 37/54 | 4121 | 1 | 1 | 0 | |
| 3/4 | 3/4 | 4/5 | 9/10 | 1 | 5/6 | 4505 | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| 1 | 11/12 | 13/15 | 4/5 | 7/9 | 47/54 | 4639 | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| 5/8 | 1/4 | 2/5 | 1/10 | 4/9 | 19/54 | 3467 | 1 | 0 | 0 | |
| 3/4 | 2/3 | 1 | 9/10 | 7/9 | 5/6 | 4505 | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| 7/8 | 3/4 | 13/15 | 3/5 | 7/9 | 7/9 | 4333 | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| 7/8 | 2/3 | 3/5 | 4/5 | 5/9 | 37/54 | 4121 | 1 | 1 | 0 | |
| 7/8 | 7/12 | 2/3 | 1 | 1 | 43/54 | 4392 | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| 3/8 | 5/12 | 4/15 | 3/10 | 2/3 | 7/18 | 3542 | 1 | 1 | 0 | |
| 7/8 | 3/4 | 14/15 | 3/5 | 2/9 | 19/27 | 4162 | 1 | 1 | 0 | |
| 5/8 | 2/3 | 2/3 | 3/5 | 4/9 | 11/18 | 3969 | 1 | 1 | 0 | |
| 1/2 | 1/3 | 8/15 | 1/5 | 4/9 | 11/27 | 3579 | 1 | 1 | 0 | |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 9/10 | 7/9 | 17/18 | 5056 | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| 7/8 | 3/4 | 11/15 | 9/10 | 7/9 | 43/54 | 4392 | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| 13/17 | 46/67 | 47/66 | 9/13 | 31/45 | 53/75 | 4230 | 12/25 | 1 | 24/25 | 2/5 |
| 76.50% | 68.67% | 71.20% | 69.20% | 68.89% | 70.67% | | | 100.00% | 96.00% | 40.00% |
| 40% Of class Advanced Performers. | | | | | | | | | | |
| Advanced Performers | | | 10 | | Avg= | 4608 | 275 | Above Adv.Perf.baseline | | |
| Satisfactory Performers | | | 14 | | Avg = | 3747 | 2/3 | 585 | 1/3 | Below Adv.Perf.baseline |
| Met Min., but not Satisfactory | | | 1 | | | | | | | |
| Best Performance Area - | | | Functional Relationships | | | | | | | |
| 2nd Best Performance Area | | | Linear Functions | | | | | | | |
| Middle Performance | | | Linear Equations and Equalities | | | | | | | |
| Next to Worst Performance Area | | | Quadratic Functions | | | | | | | |
| Worst Performance Area | | | Properties and Attributes of functions | | | | | | | |

EDLD 5398: Patricia Startz SID: L20052259 Internship for Principal

Table 2: Spring 2012 9th Grade Biology STAAR EOC Results- Raw Data

| Biology | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|--------|--------|--|--------|--------|------|------|-----|------------|---|
| CSF | MG | BEC | BPS | IES | Tot | SSS | MS | SP | AP | |
| 9/11 | 8/11 | 1 | 6/11 | 9/11 | 7/9 | 4376 | 1 | 1 | 0 | |
| 7/11 | 10/11 | 1/2 | 5/11 | 6/11 | 11/18 | 4000 | 1 | 1 | 0 | |
| 8/11 | 4/11 | 3/5 | 3/11 | 7/11 | 14/27 | 3801 | 1 | 1 | 0 | |
| 6/11 | 7/11 | 7/10 | 5/11 | 7/11 | 16/27 | 3949 | 1 | 1 | 0 | |
| 3/11 | 6/11 | 2/5 | 5/11 | 4/11 | 11/27 | 3579 | 1 | 1 | 0 | |
| 5/11 | 4/11 | 3/5 | 7/11 | 9/11 | 31/54 | 3912 | 1 | 1 | 0 | |
| 6/11 | 9/11 | 4/5 | 3/11 | 8/11 | 17/27 | 4026 | 1 | 1 | 0 | |
| 5/11 | 6/11 | 7/10 | 5/11 | 6/11 | 29/54 | 3838 | 1 | 1 | 0 | |
| 8/11 | 9/11 | 4/5 | 6/11 | 1 | 7/9 | 4376 | 1 | 1 | 0 | |
| 6/11 | 9/11 | 3/5 | 9/11 | 8/11 | 19/27 | 4189 | 1 | 1 | 0 | |
| 10/11 | 10/11 | 1 | 7/11 | 10/11 | 47/54 | 4686 | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| 8/11 | 7/11 | 1 | 8/11 | 10/11 | 43/54 | 4429 | 1 | 1 | 0 | |
| 5/11 | 5/11 | 4/5 | 8/11 | 9/11 | 35/54 | 4065 | 1 | 1 | 0 | |
| 9/11 | 8/11 | 3/5 | 7/11 | 8/11 | 19/27 | 4189 | 1 | 1 | 0 | |
| 4/11 | 3/11 | 1/2 | 6/11 | 3/11 | 7/18 | 3541 | 1 | 1 | 0 | |
| 7/11 | 7/11 | 4/5 | 6/11 | 6/11 | 17/27 | 4026 | 1 | 1 | 0 | |
| 6/11 | 5/11 | 4/5 | 5/11 | 9/11 | 11/18 | 4000 | 1 | 1 | 0 | |
| 7/11 | 4/11 | 1 | 6/11 | 9/11 | 2/3 | 4105 | 1 | 1 | 0 | |
| 6/11 | 5/11 | 4/5 | 7/11 | 7/11 | 11/18 | 4000 | 1 | 1 | 0 | |
| 6/11 | 5/11 | 1/2 | 4/11 | 6/11 | 13/27 | 3728 | 1 | 1 | 0 | |
| 5/11 | 7/11 | 7/10 | 8/11 | 10/11 | 37/54 | 4147 | 1 | 1 | 0 | |
| 4/11 | 5/11 | 1/2 | 6/11 | 8/11 | 14/27 | 3801 | 1 | 1 | 0 | |
| 5/11 | 6/11 | 1/2 | 5/11 | 4/11 | 25/54 | 3691 | 1 | 1 | 0 | |
| 10/11 | 9/11 | 9/10 | 6/11 | 9/11 | 43/54 | 4429 | 1 | 1 | 0 | |
| 9/11 | 8/11 | 7/10 | 8/11 | 9/11 | 41/54 | 4326 | 1 | 1 | 0 | |
| 34/57 | 32/53 | 47/66 | 28/51 | 37/53 | 29/46 | 4048 | 9/25 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 58.75% | 59.87% | 70.05% | 54.92% | 69.34% | 62.45% | 4048 | 9/25 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Advanced Performers - | | | 1 | | | | | | | |
| Satisfactory Performers - | | | 24 | | Avg= | 4048 | 9/25 | 528 | Below Adv. | |
| Best Performance Area - | | | Biological Evolution and Classification | | | | | | | |
| 2nd Best Performance Area- | | | Interdependence within Environmental Systems | | | | | | | |
| Next to Worst Perf.area | | | Mechanisms of Genetics | | | | | | | |
| Worst Performance Area | | | Cell Structure and Function | | | | | | | |

EDLD 5398: Patricia Startz SID: L20052259 Internship for Principal

Table 3. Spring 2012 9th Grade English I Reading STAAR EOC Results- Raw Data

| Eng1Rdg | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------|--------|---------|------------------------------|--------|---------|-----------|------------|---|----------------|--------|--|
| UAAG /sarss | UAAG / sarps | TSAS | UAAG-mc | UALT | UAIT | TMCS | TRS | SSS | MS | SP | AP | |
| 2/3 | 1/3 | 1/2 | 5/8 | 7/8 | 11/14 | 15/19 | 39/56 | 2072 | 1 | 1 | 0 | |
| 1/3 | 1/3 | 1/3 | 5/8 | 13/16 | 6/7 | 15/19 | 9/14 | 2000 | 1 | 1 | 0 | |
| 2/3 | 1/3 | 1/2 | 3/4 | 11/16 | 6/7 | 29/38 | 19/28 | 2047 | 1 | 1 | 0 | |
| 1/3 | 1/3 | 1/3 | 1 | 3/4 | 1 | 17/19 | 5/7 | 2097 | 1 | 1 | 0 | |
| 1/3 | 1/3 | 1/3 | 3/4 | 11/16 | 4/7 | 25/38 | 31/56 | 1900 | 1 | 1 | 0 | |
| 0/9 | 1/3 | 1/6 | 3/4 | 7/8 | 13/14 | 33/38 | 9/14 | 2000 | 1 | 1 | 0 | |
| 1/3 | 1/3 | 1/3 | 3/4 | 1 | 13/14 | 35/38 | 41/56 | 2124 | 1 | 1 | 0 | |
| 0/9 | 0/9 | 0/18 | 3/4 | 13/16 | 9/14 | 14/19 | 1/2 | 1843 | 1 | 0 | 0 | |
| 2/3 | 2/3 | 2/3 | 7/8 | 15/16 | 13/14 | 35/38 | 47/56 | 2353 | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| 2/3 | 2/3 | 2/3 | 1 | 7/8 | 1 | 18/19 | 6/7 | 2412 | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| 1/3 | 2/3 | 1/2 | 7/8 | 15/16 | 13/14 | 35/38 | 11/14 | 2220 | 1 | 1 | 0 | |
| 1/3 | 1/3 | 1/3 | 1 | 15/16 | 1 | 37/38 | 43/56 | 2185 | 1 | 1 | 0 | |
| 0/9 | 1/3 | 1/6 | 1 | 7/8 | 13/14 | 35/38 | 19/28 | 2047 | 1 | 1 | 0 | |
| 2/3 | 2/3 | 2/3 | 3/4 | 7/8 | 1 | 17/19 | 23/28 | 2304 | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| 0/9 | 0/9 | 0/18 | 1/2 | 9/16 | 1/7 | 15/38 | 15/56 | 1588 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 2/3 | 2/3 | 2/3 | 7/8 | 7/8 | 5/7 | 31/38 | 43/56 | 2185 | 1 | 1 | 0 | |
| 2/3 | 2/3 | 2/3 | 1 | 5/8 | 11/14 | 29/38 | 41/56 | 2124 | 1 | 1 | 0 | |
| 1/3 | 1/3 | 1/3 | 7/8 | 13/16 | 11/14 | 31/38 | 37/56 | 2024 | 1 | 1 | 0 | |
| 2/3 | 2/3 | 2/3 | 7/8 | 7/8 | 13/14 | 17/19 | 23/28 | 2304 | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| 1/3 | 1/3 | 1/3 | 3/4 | 11/16 | 4/7 | 25/38 | 31/56 | 1900 | 1 | 1 | 0 | |
| 0/9 | 1/3 | 1/6 | 7/8 | 7/8 | 6/7 | 33/38 | 9/14 | 2000 | 1 | 1 | 0 | |
| 0/9 | 1/3 | 1/6 | 3/4 | 15/16 | 5/7 | 31/38 | 17/28 | 1950 | 1 | 1 | 0 | |
| 2/3 | 2/3 | 2/3 | 5/8 | 11/16 | 1 | 15/19 | 3/4 | 2154 | 1 | 1 | 0 | |
| 1/3 | 2/3 | 1/2 | 1 | 7/8 | 6/7 | 17/19 | 43/56 | 2185 | 1 | 1 | 0 | |
| 2/3 | 0/9 | 1/3 | 1 | 7/8 | 13/14 | 35/38 | 41/56 | 2124 | 1 | 1 | 0 | |
| 29/57 | 31/66 | 10/23 | 33/40 | 33/40 | 19/23 | 52/63 | 42/61 | 2085 17/25 | 24/25 | 23/25 | 4/25 | |
| 50.88% | 46.97% | 43.48% | 82.50% | 82.50% | 82.57% | 82.53% | 68.86% | | 96.00% | 92.00% | 16.00% | |
| Advanced Performers - | | | | 4 | | Average | 2343 1/4 | | | | | |
| Satisfactory Performers - | | | | 19 | | Average | 2070 8/19 | | 233 11/19 | Below Advanced | | |
| Met Minimum, but not Satisfactory - | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | |
| Did not meet Minimum | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | |
| Best Performance Area - | | | | Analysis of text MC | | | | | | | | |
| 2nd Best Performance area- | | | | Short Answer analysis | | | | | * Short Answer Analysis and Ratings Need major improvement. | | | |
| Next to Worst Performance area- | | | | Short Answer ratings | | | | | | | | |
| Worst Performance area- | | | | Overall Short Answer Average | | | | | | | | |

EDLD 5398: Patricia Startz SID: L20052259 Internship for Principal

Table 4. Spring 2012 9th Grade English I Writing STAAR EOC Results- Raw Data

| Eng1Wrtg | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---------|--------|-------|------------------------|-----------------|------------|------------|-----------|------------|----|
| litcmp | expcomp | totcmp | revsn | editing | tmcscr | totwrtgscr | sss | ms | sp | ap |
| 3/4 | 3/4 | 3/4 | 1 | 14/15 | 29/30 | 53/62 | 2278 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 3/4 | 3/4 | 3/4 | 14/15 | 14/15 | 14/15 | 26/31 | 2239 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 1 | 3/4 | 7/8 | 2/3 | 13/15 | 23/30 | 51/62 | 2201 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 5/8 | 3/8 | 1/2 | 1 | 2/3 | 5/6 | 41/62 | 1899 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 5/8 | 1/2 | 9/16 | 8/15 | 11/15 | 19/30 | 37/62 | 1802 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 3/4 | 5/8 | 11/16 | 4/5 | 13/15 | 5/6 | 47/62 | 2067 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 3/4 | 3/4 | 3/4 | 13/15 | 13/15 | 13/15 | 25/31 | 2166 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 5/8 | 3/8 | 1/2 | 4/5 | 11/15 | 23/30 | 39/62 | 1849 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 3/4 | 5/8 | 11/16 | 14/15 | 13/15 | 9/10 | 49/62 | 2131 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 5/8 | 3/4 | 11/16 | 4/5 | 13/15 | 5/6 | 47/62 | 2067 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 3/4 | 3/4 | 3/4 | 13/15 | 13/15 | 13/15 | 25/31 | 2166 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 7/8 | 7/8 | 7/8 | 13/15 | 14/15 | 9/10 | 55/62 | 2365 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 3/4 | 7/8 | 13/16 | 14/15 | 4/5 | 13/15 | 26/31 | 2239 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 7/8 | 7/8 | 7/8 | 14/15 | 11/15 | 5/6 | 53/62 | 2278 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 1/2 | 1/4 | 3/8 | 1/3 | 8/15 | 13/30 | 25/62 | 1563 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1/2 | 1/2 | 1/2 | 2/3 | 2/3 | 2/3 | 18/31 | 1779 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3/4 | 5/8 | 11/16 | 11/15 | 1 | 13/15 | 24/31 | 2099 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 3/4 | 7/8 | 13/16 | 4/5 | 14/15 | 13/15 | 26/31 | 2239 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 3/4 | 7/8 | 13/16 | 14/15 | 4/5 | 13/15 | 26/31 | 2239 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 1/2 | 3/4 | 5/8 | 2/5 | 11/15 | 17/30 | 37/62 | 1802 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 5/8 | 1/2 | 9/16 | 14/15 | 13/15 | 9/10 | 45/62 | 2000 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 3/4 | 1/2 | 5/8 | 11/15 | 2/5 | 17/30 | 37/62 | 1802 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 3/4 | 3/4 | 3/4 | 4/5 | 3/5 | 7/10 | 45/62 | 2000 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 7/8 | 3/4 | 13/16 | 13/15 | 14/15 | 9/10 | 53/62 | 2278 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 7/8 | 3/4 | 13/16 | 11/15 | 13/15 | 4/5 | 25/31 | 2166 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 29/40 | 65/97 | 30/43 | 31/39 | 4/5 | 59/74 | 44/59 | 2068 14/25 | 23/25 | 19/25 | 0 |
| 72% | 67% | 70% | 79% | 79% | 79% | 74% | | 92% | 75% | 0% |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| Did not Meet Minimum Score - | | | | 2 | | | | | | |
| Met minimum score, but not Satisfactory - | | | | 4 | | | | | | |
| Satisfactory Performance - | | | | 19 | Average Score = | | 2164 1/19 | 289 1/19 | Ab.Bs. | |
| Advanced Performance | | | | 0 | | | | 311 18/19 | Bel.Ad.Prf | |
| Tied for Best performance area | | | | Revision and editing | | | | | | |
| 2nd best performance area | | | | Literary Composition | | | | | | |
| Worst performance area | | | | Expository Composition | | | | | | |

EDLD 5398: Patricia Startz SID: L20052259 Internship for Principal

Table 5. Spring 2012 9th Grade World Geography STAAR EOC Results- Raw Data

| WGeo | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------|-------|-------|--------------------|------------|-----------------------------------|-------|-----|
| HGC | GEO | CLTR | ECSTS | TOT | SSS | MS | SP | AP |
| 6/7 | 23/26 | 11/14 | 11/14 | 57/68 | 4404 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 5/7 | 21/26 | 4/7 | 4/7 | 47/68 | 4000 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 1/2 | 15/26 | 1/2 | 1/2 | 9/17 | 3660 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 13/14 | 23/26 | 4/7 | 5/7 | 27/34 | 4266 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 3/7 | 15/26 | 3/14 | 9/14 | 33/68 | 3573 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 4/7 | 10/13 | 3/7 | 4/7 | 21/34 | 3839 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 11/14 | 8/13 | 4/7 | 11/14 | 23/34 | 3967 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 6/7 | 9/13 | 5/7 | 6/7 | 13/17 | 4183 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 6/7 | 12/13 | 11/14 | 11/14 | 29/34 | 4464 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 13/14 | 25/26 | 4/7 | 11/14 | 57/68 | 4404 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 6/7 | 11/13 | 1/2 | 11/14 | 13/17 | 4183 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 11/14 | 21/26 | 5/7 | 1 | 14/17 | 4359 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 1 | 23/26 | 6/7 | 13/14 | 31/34 | 4741 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 5/7 | 21/26 | 11/14 | 6/7 | 27/34 | 4266 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 3/7 | 9/26 | 1/7 | 2/7 | 21/68 | 3203 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1/2 | 10/13 | 9/14 | 5/7 | 23/34 | 3967 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 5/7 | 11/13 | 9/14 | 9/14 | 25/34 | 4106 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 1 | 25/26 | 13/14 | 6/7 | 16/17 | 4949 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 1/2 | 23/26 | 2/7 | 9/14 | 43/68 | 3870 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 1/2 | 19/26 | 3/7 | 5/7 | 21/34 | 3839 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 11/14 | 23/26 | 4/7 | 13/14 | 55/68 | 4311 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 4/7 | 21/26 | 9/14 | 11/14 | 49/68 | 4070 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 11/14 | 8/13 | 1/2 | 13/14 | 47/68 | 4000 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 11/14 | 11/13 | 5/7 | 6/7 | 55/68 | 4311 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 11/14 | 23/26 | 4/7 | 5/7 | 13/17 | 4183 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 45/62 | 51/65 | 41/70 | 44/59 | 34/47 | 4124 18/25 | 24/25 | 24/25 | 1/5 |
| 72% | 78% | 58% | 74% | 72% | | 96% | 96% | 17% |
| HGC=History Government & Citizenship | | | | | | Next to worst performance area | | |
| GEO=Geography | | | | | | Best Performance area | | |
| CLTR=Culture | | | | | | Worst performance area | | |
| ECSTS=Economics, Science, Technology, & Society | | | | | | 2nd Best performance area | | |
| Advanced performance = 5 | | | | Highest score-4949 | | Average Sco 4592 2/5 | | |
| Satisfactory Performance = 19 | | | | Avg= | | 4050 3/19 353 16/19 Bel.Adv.Perf. | | |
| Minimum Score not met = 1 (Special Ed Student) | | | | | | Average score 72% | | |

EDLD 5398: Patricia Startz SID: L20052259 Internship for Principal

The data in the previous tables clearly shows room for improvement in teaching and learning. The literature review tells us that curriculum alignment is the most recommended method of improving student achievement and accomplishing sustained school wide improvement. Furthermore, the literature review has provided verification that CSCOPE is a viable research based curriculum alignment tool that has been used successfully by many schools to improve student performance on formal statewide assessments. My informal interviews, which were not recorded, are very supportive of the process of curriculum alignment utilizing the research based technology enhanced curriculum alignment tool, CSCOPE. As I continue my 3 year professional development plan, this project will be further monitored.

Conclusions and Recommendations (Section Five)

This is a work in process... There is no final conclusion about the success or failure of this project; however, the knowledge is certain now that curriculum alignment is viewed by many stellar educational professionals as the most critical element in sustained school improvement. Also certain is the fact that the technology based and enhanced curriculum alignment tool, CSCAPE, and the processes it guides teachers to undertake creates a, “Guaranteed and Viable Curriculum,” with documentable evidence that individual instructors have/have not taught their students to state required standards within the time guidelines required to ensure student success on statewide assessments as defined by the Texas Education Agency. Our professional staff can draw from both the new CSCAPE resources and existing resources while adhering to the timelines built into CSCAPE to create curriculum that in their professional judgment, best meets the needs of their students and their requirement to teach today’s modern standards.

References (Final Section)

Fullan, M. (2002, May), The Change, *Educational Leadership*, 59(8), 16-20.

Hamilton, C. (2008), *A Guaranteed and Viable Curriculum: Taking a Closer Look*, TESC
August 7, 2012, from <http://www.cscope.us>, 1-16.

McTighe, J.& Thomas, R. (2003, February), Backward Design for Forward Action, *Educational Leadership*, 60(5), 52-55.

Parsley, D., Dean, C., & Miller, K., (2006, October), Selecting the Right Data, *Educational Leadership*, 7(2), 28-42.

Ronka, D., Lachat, M., Slaughter, R., & Meltzer, J., (2009, January) Answering the Questions that Count, *Educational Leadership*; December 2008/January 2009; 19-24.

Rooney, J., (2008, February), What Do We Believe?, *Educational Leadership*, 65(8), 88-90.

Squires, D., (2005, Dec.), Aligned Curriculum and Student Achievement, *Edvantia*, December 2005, 1-7.

Turner, J., (2003), Ensuring What is Tested is Taught: Curriculum Coherence and Alignment, Educational Research Service, 2000 Clarendon Boulevard, Arlington, VA, 2-16, from: <http://www.ers.org>, March 2012.

Tweed, A., (2007, April 30), *Aligning Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment to Standards*, retrieved from <http://www.mcrel.org>, May 25, 2012.

Appendix:

Patricia Startz: EDLD 5397:8052
Action Research Plan –Draft Rev. 6.

Goal: To show how interactive student response systems can be utilized to more fully develop student higher order cognitive skills.

| Action Steps(s): | Person(s) Responsible: | Timeline: Start/End | Needed Resources | Evaluation |
|---|------------------------|----------------------------|---|--|
| <p>Posted on wiki: https://pastartz.wikispaces.com/EDLD+5397-Internship+for+Supervision</p> <p>I cannot locate an Embedded assignment log for this course at this point, but will keep looking.</p> | | June 1, 2011 – August 2011 | Internet – Educational Research Reporting sites Vendor materials. | Literature reviews for articles and books with noteworthy information, quotes, and examples in a useable format. |
| Project Terminated: | | | | |

The principal preferred that I seek a different Action Research Project. It took a while to determine exactly how to meet the requirements for the course and serve the teachers on my campus in the best way possible without inconveniencing anyone or disrupting the regular flow of instruction in progress. Some of the pieces of my plan were included in the regular preparedness activities conducted by elementary teachers, i.e. meeting with parents, discussing student expectations, the purpose of homework packets, and the provision of tutorials for students in need of extra help. Teachers, administrators, and parents were concerned about results for the first round of STAAR assessments.

As a result, I focused my attention on assisting the testing coordinator with the processes of online assessment registration and administration; analyzing AEIS results for the previous year in the process of updating district and Campus improvement plans; and attempting to figure out what sort of action research activity could work at all. In the middle of these processes, I learned that teachers were increasingly concerned about curriculum gaps from grade to grade and course to course. I began to research the importance of curriculum alignment to student assessment success and search for a technology and research based tool to help teachers achieve systemic curriculum alignment. At about the same time, I was exposed to the curriculum alignment tool, CSCOE. It is a tool previously considered, by our administrators, but not utilized due to bandwidth issues, with those issues removed, it seemed to be a viable option.

| Goal: To discover the importance of curriculum alignment to student success; a research based technology tool for systemic curriculum alignment; and develop a training plan for implementing systemic research based curriculum alignment to prepare teachers to better prepare all of their students for mastery of new curriculum standards. | | | | |
|--|---|-------------------------------|---|---|
| Action Steps(s): | Person(s) Responsible: | Timeline: Start/End | Needed Resources | Evaluation |
| Literature and assessment results Reviews | Researcher | August 2011- September 2012. | Internet- Educational Research reporting sites, vendor materials | Curriculum alignment and curriculum alignment tool articles |
| Analyze viability of network to support externally based curriculum alignment tools, online assessments, professional development, etc. | Researcher | August 2011 – September 2012 | Network bandwidth, equipment, personal computer requirements. | Current status of network. |
| Recommendations for corrective measures to utilize outside resources | Researcher | October 2011 - September 2012 | Requirements, failure documentation, suggested corrective measures | Current status, corrective measures taken. |
| Question Lamar peers, regional service center staff, and other administrators/teachers about technology and researched based curriculum alignment tools in use. | Researcher | February 2012 – May 2012 | Internet, email, face-to-face informal q&a, and access to products within a product. Administrator buy-in. \$Funds for purchasing program access and providing staff development. | Samples of associated documents and/or notes. Administrator decision to proceed with a product. Product purchase agreement. |
| Devise professional development plan | Researcher, district administrators, elementary campus lead teacher. | June 2012 – August 2012 | Trainer and trainee availability; \$Funds for purchasing program access; sufficient bandwidth and computer capacity to support program use by all staff. | Training Schedule: Funds Approval/Invoices Staff approved for training during summer; |
| Implement training/support | Researcher, region service center staff, elementary campus lead teacher | July 27, 2012 – May 2013 | Trainer and trainee availability; sufficient bandwidth and computer capacity to support program use by all staff; | Training and use expectations; Training evaluations Training appointments |

| Goal: To discover the importance of curriculum alignment to student success; a research based technology tool for systemic curriculum alignment; and develop a training plan for implementing systemic research based curriculum alignment to prepare teachers to better prepare all of their students for mastery of new curriculum standards. | | | | |
|---|---|----------------------------|--|---|
| Action Steps(s): | Person(s) Responsible: | Timeline: Start/End | Needed Resources | Evaluation |
| | | | In-Service and during year training time allotments. | met, rescheduled, cancelled and not made up; |
| Program results | Researcher, region service center staff, elementary campus lead teacher | June – August 2013 | Training logs; teacher use logs; Student scores on STAAR assessments overall course scores | Teacher program evaluations; Student performance results; Principal evaluations |
| Project Action Research Summary: 1) Literacy Review Summary 2) Descriptions of research process; 3) Outcome of network analysis and corresponding action taken in support of project; 4) Professional Development outline; 5) Summary report of training implementation procedures, teacher evaluations available at the end of the project timeline as it corresponds to my coursework. | Researcher | August 2011 – Sept. 2012 | All of the above resources. | Research report. Teacher evaluations of professional development; Where baseline EOC data exists from previous year, Share the report on Edblog, with teachers, with principal. |

Format based on Tool 7.1 from *Examining What We Do to Improve Our Schools*

(Harris, Edmonson, and Combs, 2010)